



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,660	07/02/2003	Karine Excoffier	SUN-P7528	7256

7590 01/12/2006  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Third Floor  
Two North Market Street  
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LY, CHEYNE D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2168

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/613,660

Applicant(s)

EXCOFFIER ET AL.

Examiner

Cheyne D. Ly

Art Unit

2168

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22, 25, 31-37 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 23, 24, 26-30, 38, 39 and 41-45 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-45 are examined on the merits.

#### CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 1 is vague and indefinite because it is not clear whether claim 1 is directed to a method or a product. <sup>Lines 1+2</sup> ~~Line~~ recites a method followed by the structural description of a "directory server" in the preamble, while, the body of the claim recites steps a) and b) supporting the method of claim 1. However, the metes and bound of the claim is not clear because it is not clear whether claim 1 is directed to a method or a product. Claims 2-15 are rejected for being dependent from claim 1.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in:

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2168

6. Claims 1-7, 10, 16-22, 25, 31-37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)(2) as being anticipated by Boreham et al. (US006768988B2) (Boreham hereafter).
7. The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.
8. In regard to claim 1, Boreham discloses a method of operating a directory server system, comprising a directory server (column 4, line 23) interacting with entries organized in a tree structure (column 2, lines 17-35), in which said entries comprise user entries (column 6, line 33, and Figure 19, line 1) and role entries (column 5, lines 38-39), ones of said role entries defining a role (column 5, lines 35-41) and having an associated scope in the tree (column 22, lines 3-29), the scope being defined from the location of said ones of said role entries in the tree (column 22, lines 3-29, column 17, line 38, to column 18, line 7, and Figures 12 and 13), according to a predefined rule (column 19, lines 25-26), with the role of an existing role entry being attached to a user entry subject to a first condition (column 6, lines 30-34), which comprises a role membership condition (column 6, lines 36-46) and the fact that the user entry belongs to the scope of the existing role entry (column 22, lines 3-29, and Figures 12 and 13), the method comprising:
  - a. Adding extra role data (column 6, lines 9-11) to the existing role entry (column 5, lines 46-48), the extra data identifying an extra scope in the tree for the existing

role entry (column 21, line 65, to column 22, line 29). It is noted that the cited disclosure anticipates the limitation of “extra scope” as defined by the instant specification, page 23, lines 4-8.

- b. Attaching the role of the existing role entry to a user entry subject to a second condition (column 5, line 50, to column 2, line 6) comprising said role membership condition and the user entry belonging to the extra scope of the existing role entry (column 21, line 65, to column 22, line 29).
9. In regard to claim 2, the existing role entry (column 5, lines 46-48) is an indirect role entry designating one or more other roles (column 16, lines 15-67). It is noted the instant specification does not specifically define the limitation of “indirect role,” therefore, the disclosure of “a nested role may contain one or more members” organized in a subtree structure has been interpreted to be consistent with the required limitation of “indirect role.”
10. In regard to claim 3, the existing role entry (column 5, lines 46-48) has an attribute designating the said one or more other roles (column 16, lines 48-64).
11. In regard to claim 4, the role membership condition comprises the user entry having an attribute designating the role in the exiting role entry (column 6, lines 31-51).
12. In regard to claim 5, the existing role entry (column 5, lines 46-48) has a role filter condition (column 6, lines 31-51), and the role membership condition comprises one or more attributes of the user entry meeting the role filter condition (column 6, lines 34-47).
13. In regard to claim 6, the existing role entry (column 5, lines 46-48) has an attribute designating the role filter condition (column 6, lines 31-51).

14. In regard to claim 7, Boreham discloses adding the extra role data to the existing role entry (column 6, lines 9-11) in the form of an added attribute having a special attribute name and being associated with an attribute value identifying the extra scope (column 11, lines 41-55).
15. In regard to claim 10, the predefined rule (column 19, lines 25-26) comprises defining the scope of the exiting role entry as a subtree of parent of the existing role entry in the tree (column 21, line 65, to column 22, line 29).
16. Claims 16-22, 25, 31-37, and 40, correspond to a director server and a computer readable medium for performing the claimed method, thus said claims are rejected for the same reasons cited for claims 1-7 and 10.

### **CONCLUSION**

17. The prior art made of record and not relied up is considered pertinent to applicant's discloser:
  - a. Barkley et al. discloses managing role/permission relationships using object access types wherein roles are organized in a hierarchical structure.
  - b. Abbey et al. discloses Ganymede as a directory server wherein roles are organized in a tree structure.
18. Claims 23, 24, 26-30, 38, 39, and 41-45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
19. Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact

Art Unit: 2168

the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance.

Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

20. For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199. The USPTO's official fax number is 571-272-8300.
21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to C. Dune Ly, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.
22. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached on (571) 272-4146.

C. Dune Ly / *CDL*  
Patent Examiner  
1/6/06

